

where the Supreme Court said that and you will not find it having said that. There is a difference between a strict statute of limitations and a statute of repose and it has been recognized in the law not only of Nebraska, but throughout this country and probably in other countries. And the Supreme Court did not indicate that it was erasing the difference between those two types of limitations. As far as accepting what the Attorney General says, I'm giving Senator Hannibal everything. He is confident that what he says the Supreme Court's Opinion is, is, in fact, what the Supreme Court's Opinion is. If what he says is true, the Attorney General can only come down and say what Senator Hannibal has said, and since all that I want in the bill is what we both claim that we mean, I'll be satisfied. The legislative history of the bill will be there. The Attorney General's Opinion saying what the word means will be there and I'm sure he will ground it on any Supreme Court language such as the kind you mention. And he will give us an opinion saying there no longer is a distinction between a strict statute of limitations and a statute of repose. That is what he will say in his opinion, and when he says that, I will buy it. And, Senator Hannibal, although I am not a religious man, I'll probably say, hallelujah, if not out loud, under my breath because I have never liked statutes of repose anyway. They are unfair, they work against the person who has been damaged; they work in the behalf of the one who negligently has done something to harm another person. They are evil. They are wicked. They are vicious. But they exist only where you are dealing with large...

SENATOR LABEDZ: One minute, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...special interest groups. It doesn't work between Senator Hannibal and myself. If I negligently hurt Senator Hannibal, he has a four-year statute of limitations and he doesn't start...that doesn't start to run against him until he knows about the damage that I caused to him, but a political subdivision such as Omaha can have an employee negligently perform an act that results in damage to a citizen's property and the citizen will not even know about it prior to the expiration of the time during which he can bring an action which means that before you bring the action your right to bring it has run out. But I'm going to abide by what the Attorney General says. And, Senator Hannibal, even if it's a poorly written opinion, if it is a poorly reasoned opinion, I'm going to be bound by it because I want the bill to say what you say that it says now. But I don't think Omaha's minions...